#### DHS Analysis of FFY 06 Federal Budget Actions Impacting Human Service Programs

There are three Congressional bills that have a direct impact on human service programs:

- 1. Labor-Health and Human Services Appropriation which includes the funding levels for discretionary human service programs.
- 2. Budget Reconciliation (S. 1932, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005) which reduces mandatory spending over 5 years and makes changes to and reauthorizes Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). Likely to receive final House approval in January or early February 2006.
- 3. Defense Appropriation which includes a 1% across the board cut to all discretionary programs, except those programs that serve veterans. Examples of human service discretionary programs include child care and development block grant and community services block grant.

#### **Child Support Recovery**

- 1. The Deficit Reduction Act prohibits drawing federal match on earned performance incentive funds starting October 1, 2007. For high performance states, such as Iowa, the impact is significant. This change will result in a loss of \$13.5 million to the Iowa Child Support Recovery Unit (CSRU). This is over a 25% reduction in CSRU's operating budget and will negatively impact collections; Iowa families will potentially lose over \$78.3 million in child support collection per year.
- 2. Other reductions are:
  - Lower federal match for paternity tests form 90% to 66%, effective October, 1, 2006.
  - A new fee of \$25 for families receiving support services when the family is not on public assistance. The federal government receives 66% of the new fee, effective October, 1, 2006.
- 4. In addition, two new unfunded mandates are created related to medical support and the review and adjustment of public assistance cases.

#### **TANF** (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families)

- 1. The Deficit Reduction Act implements a change that will require states to apply TANF work participation rates to separate state programs, effective October 1, 2006. Iowa, as well as at least 40 other states, uses a separate state program for its two-parent families. Iowa will be unable to meet the 90% two-parent work participation rate without significant additional resources. We estimate it will take at least \$5 million more annually to revamp Iowa's PROMISE JOBS program in order to achieve this level of work participation.
- 2. The bill eliminates the TANF high performance bonus. Iowa has received a TANF bonus the past 3 years, averaging almost \$6.0 million. Eliminating the bonus will have a direct impact on TANF funded programs and will require Iowa to reduce some TANF funded services.
- 3. TANF and Child Support Interrelationship The reductions to the Iowa Child Support Recovery Unit and the resulting decreases in child support collections will also include decreased collections from assigned support from Family Investment Program (FIP) families. The state's share of the assigned support is used to pay for FIP cash grants and to meet our TANF MOE.
  - This means Iowa would face a shortfall of \$3.3 million in state funds needed for FIP cash grants.

• The combined reduction of \$6.6 million (\$3.3 million in reduced state share of collections and \$3.3 million in reduced TANF grant for not meeting MOE) will impact an estimated 1,656 families per month.

#### SCHIP (State Children's Health Insurance Program)

The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 included a nation-wide increase of \$283 million for providing additional allocations for States projecting SCHIP shortfalls in FFY 2006. Iowa is one of the states projecting a shortfall. Until the details of how this additional money will be allocated, we do not know whether it will be sufficient to meet the projected shortfall.

#### Medicaid

The projected savings of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 are to be achieved by changing how Medicaid pays for prescription drugs; eliminating provider taxes and intergovernmental transfers; restricting asset transfers to become Medicaid-eligible; giving states new options for cost sharing; and projected savings resulting from reducing fraud, waste, and abuse. The Act also provides for additional federal scrutiny and oversight of states by providing for 150 new federal auditors. Several administrative and programmatic changes are also made, such as requiring states to document client citizenship prior to determining eligibility and allowing families with children with disabilities to "buy-in" to Medicaid.

#### Title IV-E Foster Care

The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 requires that eligibility be re-determined every 12 months and for candidacy every 6 months. Field Operations Appropriation - Iowa DHS currently redetermines eligibility every 12 months but does not re-determine candidacy every 6 months. The impact could cost an estimated \$1.1 million.

#### Child Care

An additional \$1 billion is authorized in mandatory budget authority for child care from FFY 2006 through 2010. It is unknown how much of these additional child care dollars would be available to Iowa or whether the additional money will be sufficient to meet Iowa's child care needs. Our preliminary assessment is that the new TANF requirements are likely to require more child care funds than are estimated to be forthcoming from the federal government.

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
SEC. 6001 Federal Upper Payment Limits	The Federal Upper Limit is a maximum reimbursement amount for selected drugs, determined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.	The bill changes how the Federal Upper Limit is calculated, from using 150% of the lowest published price to 250% of the average manufacturer price. The impact is to lower the maximum reimbursement that will be allowed for these drugs.	1/1/07	No impact to the consumer; it would impact providers (both prescribers and pharmacies).	Estimated savings of \$1 million in state funds for both the Federal Upper Limit and Physician Administered Drugs.  Significant programming	This may impact Iowa's State Maximum Allowable Cost (SMAC) list, which applies to generic drugs.  N/A
SEC. 6002 Physician Administered Drugs	Iowa currently does not collect drug rebate on drugs administered in a physician office.	This would require states to collect rebates on these drugs. In order to do that, the physician will be required to submit additional data to the state Medicaid Program. A similar change has been recommended by DHS in the past and was considered in last year's budget process.	1/1/08	No impact to the consumer. Physicians will have to provide additional information on their claim forms.	changes will be required. The costs for programming and provider training will offset some of the savings in the first year.	
SEC. 6031. Encouraging enactment of State False Claims Acts	Iowa currently does not have a State False Claims Act.  When states recover funds, the recovery is split between the state	This section reduces the amount that must be returned to the federal government by 10%, if the recovery action was under a state false claims act. This	1/1/07	Providers would have to pay greater penalties than under the current program. This could impact provider	Minimal increase in state recoveries. The state already recovers these types of overpayments,	N/A

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
	and federal government at the Federal matching percentage (about 64%).	increase the state share of the recovery from 36% to 46%.  The bill is encouraging states to enact false claims acts as a tool to collect from providers who were paid for inappropriate claims.  They require use of punative actions against the provider, including up to triple damages.  Typically used for purposeful or egregious actions by a provider.		participation.	and it is anticipated a State false claims act would be rarely used. DHS's experience has been that Iowa provider overpayments are usually billing mistakes rather than purposeful false claims.	
SEC. 6032. Employee Education about Fraud and Abuse	Iowa currently does not have a requirement that a business (any provider having more than \$5M in Medicaid claims) educate its employees regarding fraud and abuse issues.	This section mandates that any provider that does more than \$5M in annual Medicaid business must have written documents and training for its employees discussing fraud and abuse issues including False Claims Act provisions, civil and criminal penalties, whistleblower protections, etc.	January 1, 2007	None	No impact to Medicaid.  Will have an increased cost to providers to develop training programs.	N/A
SEC. 6033. Prohibition on Re-Stocking and	Iowa currently does not monitor to ensure that pharmacies do not return	This section prohibits a pharmacy from restocking a drug that	1 <sup>st</sup> day of 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter following	None	We believe there is no fiscal impact to State, because	N/A

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
Double Billing of Prescription Drugs	drugs to inventory. Purchased drugs are to be dispensed to the client, and not returned to inventory, but no systematic process is in place to monitor this.	has been paid for by Medicaid unless the cost of the drug has been returned less a restocking fee.	enactment of the Act		we believe this is already prohibited, but we need to check with the Board of Pharmacy.	
SEC. 6034. Medicaid Integrity Program	Iowa currently conducts program audits, utilization reviews, Third Party Liability recovery, estate recovery, recipient health education, etc.	The bill increases CMS's oversight of these activities. CMS is appropriated 100 additional FTEs, and significant new funding for these efforts (up to \$75 million by the fourth year) to increase audits and provide technical support to state Medicaid program.  In addition, the bill requires data matching with Medicare to compare Medicaid and Medicare payments to identify provider fraud.	Effective date of July 1, 2007 at the latest.	None.  Possible impact on provider from increased audit activity by both CMS and the state, particularly in the areas of HCBS waivers and managed care (identified as target areas by CMS).	Possible increased cost due to more audit findings against the state. Possible increased savings from the Medicare data match, and the technical support offered by CMS.  Net impact is unknown.	
SEC. 6035. Enhancing Third Party Identification and Payment	Requires Medicaid to pay all pharmacy, prenatal and preventive pediatric care claims upfront, and then "chase" the private insurer.	Allows states to eliminate "pay and chase", meaning bill the private insurer first, and then only pay the remainder, rather than Medicaid paying first	January 1, 2006.	None	In increased recoveries of an estimated \$4 million. Also, by obtaining the additional insurance	None

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
		and trying to recover from the insurer at a later date.  Also allows states to aggressively obtain TPL carrier policy information.			coverage information, many more claims would be cost-avoided, thus greatly reducing the state dollars paid initially.	
SEC. 6036 Demonstration Pilot for institutions for mental diseases (IMD) to supply stabilization of emergency conditions.	Per federal requirements, there is no Medicaid coverage for emergency services for persons ages 19-64 through the IMDs in Iowa.	Establishes a pilot program to allow certain IMDs to provide emergency services and to stabilize individuals in those emergency situations. The pilot is limited to IMDs that are not publicly owned or operated. Iowa does not have any such facilities and will not qualify to participate in the pilot program.	FFY 2006		No fiscal impact as Iowa has no qualifying facilities.	None
SEC. 6051 Managed Care Organization Provider Tax Reform	Iowa currently has no tax associated specifically with managed care organizations.	Changes federal definitions of the types of Managed Care Organizations included under state's provider taxes.	For any HMO contract in effect December 8, 2005.	None. There is currently no such tax on MCO premiums in Iowa.	No fiscal impact.	None
SEC. 6052 Targeted case management	Iowa rules define the case management service and process.	The bill sets certain definitions and limitations. Iowa rules are already in	1/1/06	None	None	None.

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
		compliance with the changes				
SEC. 6071 Money-Follows- the-Person Demonstration Program	Iowa currently offers Home and Community Based Waiver Services and has various initiatives to try to decrease use of institutional care. Iowa also has various quality initiatives.	Allows states to apply for demonstration programs to increase monitoring and improve the quality of Home and Community Based Services, and expand availability of HCBS services while reducing reliance on institutional long-term care services. Also includes increased ability for consumer self-direction.	1/1/2007	Positive impact to consumers from increased quality and choice, and availability of home based services.	Iowa has a number of initiatives that fall under the same goals as the demonstration program. The bill requires states to meet several measures of costeffectiveness and maintenance of effort. More research is required to determine if there would be a benefit for Iowa to apply.	
SEC. 6081 Medicaid Transformation Grants	The IowaCare health initiatives and the Iowa Medicaid Enterprise include a number of projects similar to those mentioned for the Medicaid Transformation Grants, such as electronic medical records and use of university based systems to increase access for the uninsured.	Allows states to apply for federal payments (NO state match required) to implement innovative methods, including use of Electronic Medical Records, increasing estate recovery, decreasing waste through PERM, medication risk management through	Allocates \$75M in FFY 2007, and \$75M in FFY 2008	Positive benefit to members from electronic medical records and medication risk management.  Possible positive benefit to university based hospitals.	Possible gain to the state, if we were to apply and be approved. Given similarity to other IME and IowaCare programs, Iowa should consider applying. Under our current initiatives we were planning to	None

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
SEC. 6082	State legislation	DUR, increasing use of generic drugs, and increasing access to physician care for the uninsured, using university based hospital/clinic systems.  Creates a program for up	January 1,	Positive in that it	need to use state match. If these grants could be drawn instead, less state funds might be needed, or can be further maximized.  Neutral. We are	None
Health Opportunity Accounts	(IowaCare Act) requires DHS to create a design plan for using Health Savings Accounts in the IowaCare program. These appear to be similar to the Health Opportunity Accounts.	to 10 states to develop demonstration programs that would give a certain Medicaid population access to Health Opportunity Accounts (similar to Health Savings Accounts). The programs must include incentives to seek preventive services, reducing inappropriate use of health care services, etc.	2007	would provide additional choice for members in how their benefits are delivered.	required to develop a design plan for HSAs in IowaCare. We are considering a program on the "cash and counseling" model. It appears possible to do within this context.	
SEC. 6083 State option to establish non-emergency medical transportation program	Non-emergency transportation (such as to medical appointments) is currently covered. The service currently has low utilization. Also, there are not always providers available to provide this transportation.	The bill proposes that states have the option of developing a brokerage system for non-emergency transportation with certain parameters.  Iowa is already considering a similar program through the	Will be effective upon enactment of this Act.  DHS proposes to offer an RFP for a brokerage	This would be a benefit to our Medicaid members to be able to better function in their communities. It may in long run save money by use of a brokerage system.	A Real Choices Grant covers the cost of doing the survey and establishment of a broker for the most part.	

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
		IowaCare reform initiatives.	provider by October 1, 2006.			
SEC. 6086(a) – Expanded access to Home and Community Based Services for the elderly and disabled	The level of care criteria for nursing facility state plan services must be the same as for Home and Community Based waiver services (HCBS).  Iowa's current waiver covers individuals up to approximately 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).	Allows states to increase the level of care for nursing facilities while keeping the current level of care for HCBS services.  This allows States to provide services currently only available under the waiver to all Medicaid enrollees under 150% FPL. This will allow more individuals under 150% FPL to qualify for these services.  However, those between 150% and 200% FPL who don't meet the higher level of care requirement for nursing facility will also no longer be eligible for Medicaid	1/1/07	This will allow more individuals under 150% FPL to qualify for HCBS services than under current federal requirements.  This will result in some individuals (those at the current level of care, but who do not meet the new higher level of care) between 150% and 200% losing Medicaid coverage.  **Only applies to new enrollees. Existing members are grandfathered in.	Could be accomplished with minimal state budget impact because the state has the option to limit services and the number of people, meaning we could continue to use waiting lists.	

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impact how much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
		services, including either nursing facility or waiver services.				
		**This only applies to new enrollees. Those currently receiving services would be grandfathered in.				
SEC. 6086 (F)(vi) & (G)(iii) - Expanded access to Home and Community Based Services for the elderly and disabled	Iowa is in the process of implementing "self-direction" of home and community based services, sometimes called "cash and counseling" in June 2006. An evaluation is not currently required to determine if the person is able direct their services themselves.	Allows states to include self-direction in the new waiver services process described above.  Under the bill, if a state offers individual the option to self-direct home and community based services, an evaluation will need to be completed to determine if they are able to direct services	1/1/2007	They will need to be evaluated before they are able to participate.	The impact will depend on how self-direction is incorporated into these efforts.	
SEC. 6087 Optional choice of self directed personal assistance services (cash and counseling)	Currently Iowa does not cover personal care services under our state plan.	Allows states who choose to provide personal care services under the state plan, to allow those services to be self-directed.  Iowa doesn't currently offer personal services under the state plan, so this has no impact.	1/1/2007	No impact on Iowans.	Increased cost if we decided to add this service to the state plan.	

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
TANF – Work participation rates (FIP, PROMISE JOBS, FaDSS)	States must meet an all case 50% work rate at 30 hrs/week avg and 2-parent 90% rate at 35 hrs/week avg or 55 hrs/week avg if receiving federally funded child care. Separate State Programs or SSPs are exempt from work rates – lowa's 2-parent FIP cases are an SSP.	SSPs no longer exempt from work rates.	10/06	FIP 2-parent families will be expected to participate in enough hours in countable work activities to meet work rates. The emphasis on meeting work rates will require lowa to adopt a more work focused approach and may require limitations on non-work activities, including education	Initial cost estimates to meet work rates are estimated at \$4.67M. Costs of failing to meet either rate include: an increase in Maintenance of Effort of \$4.13M penalties through reduced TANF funding. Penalties depend on which rate the state fails to meet and degree of failure; maximum penalty for failure to meet the all- case rate=\$4.6M; maximum penalty for failure to meet 2- parent only rate = \$392,000. States must replace any TANF reduction with state funds not countable for MOE.	TANF funds may need to be redirected from other programs to meet costs of meeting rates.  Meeting work rates will result in increased childcare costs. As FIP families have priority for receiving childcare, increased expenditures for FIP childcare will reduce funding (state and federal) available for non-FIP families.
TANF – Caseload reduction credit for work rates (FIP, PROMISE JOBS, FaDSS)	States can reduce the work rates through caseload reduction credits comparing current caseloads to FFY 95 caseloads – lowa's adjusted all case rate for FFY 04 = 8.8%. As	Base year for comparison changed to FFY 2005	10/1/2006	See above. Additional 1-parent FIP cases will also be expected to participate in countable work activities.	Using FFY 2005 as the comparison year will mean smaller reductions so any adjusted rate will be closer to the required 50% and 90% rates. Estimated adjusted rates for FFY 07 are 47.3% for all cases	See above

	noted above, Iowa did not have to meet the 2-parent rate for FFY 04.				and 80.3% for 2- parent. See above for costs of meeting work rates and of failing to meet rates.	
TANF – New federal oversight of defining and counting work activities and requirement to do data reporting of SSPs (FIP, PROMISE JOBS, FaDSS)	States have considerable flexibility in defining/counting hours in meeting work rates.  SSP's are not subject to quarterly data reporting.	By June 2006, HHS to issue regulations regarding: which activities count toward meeting work rates; methods for reporting and documenting/verifying hours; and when adults must meet rates. SSPs providing "assistance" become subject to quarterly data reporting.	10/1/006	May change what activities are counted towards work participation. This could limit what participants could do.  Documentation/verification requirements may also have an impact on clients.	Expected restrictions on what counts as work and who must be counted are expected to make it more difficult to meet work rates – see estimated costs above. In addition, it's expected that significant system changes will be needed to comply with these regulations. Without additional details on these requirements, cost estimates are ball park at best. 4,000 hours X \$80/hr = \$320,000.	See above.
TANF – High Performance Bonuses	TANF high performance bonuses totaling \$200M are issued annually for high performance in a number of areas including obtaining/retaining employment. Iowa has received bonuses 6 out of 7 years averaging nearly \$6M the past 3 years.	High performance bonuses are eliminated after FFY 05.	Bonuses will be issued once more for FFY 05 in the fall of 2006.	Clients will be affected to the extent that funding of specific TANF-funded programs is decreased or eliminated.	The maximum possible bonus = \$6.6M	Reduces overall TANF funding – decisions will need to be made which programs will be affected (see list of TANF funded programs)

			1 71	1 0044		
Transfer of	When determining if	When determining if	Upon	Prevents disposing of	Approximately 400	None
Assets and	an asset transfer	an asset transfer	enactment	assets in order to qualify for	transfers of asset	
Medicaid	would disqualify a	would disqualify a		Medicaid. Fewer will	referrals are made in	
Eligibility	person from long	person from long		qualify for Medicaid but the	a year.	
	term care services,	term care services		impact in lowa will be		
	Iowa: - looks back	under this bill:		minimal because lowa		
	60 months for	requires look back		already has a 5 year look		
	transfer to a trust	to be increased to		back where the person that		
	but only 36 months	60 months for all		received the asset transfer		
	for all other	transfers.		is asked to repay Medicaid.		
	transfers.	The penalty period		Prevents potential clients		
	The penalty period	is calculated by		from giving loans or gifts for		
	is calculated by	dividing the value of		5 years prior to needing		
	dividing the value of	the asset		facility care.		
	the asset	transferred by				
	transferred by	average cost of care				
	average cost of	to come up with the				
	care to come up	number of months				
	with the number of	the person could				
	months the person	have paid privately.				
	could have paid	Those months are not covered this bill:				
	privately. Those months are not					
	covered. The	requires the penalty period to begin on				· ·
	penalty period:	1 <sup>st</sup> of month transfer				
	begins the penalty	or 1 <sup>st</sup> of month				
	on 1 <sup>st</sup> of month	Medicaid eligible,				
	transfer made;	whichever is later;				
	applies penalty	requires the penalty				
	periods only for full	period to apply to				
	months by rounding	full and any partial				
	and covering partial	month; allows the				
	months; applies a	option of applying				
	penalty period for	penalties for the				
	each transfer	total of all transfers				
	separately; does	made within the look				
	not consider a note	back period;				
	or loan a transfer of	requires the State to				
	assets; does not	consider a note or		·		
	consider purchase	loan as a transfer of				
	of life estate as an	assets, unless the				
	asset transfer,	repayment meets				

			1 71	IUUTT		
	when the person fails to live on the property for one year after purchase; Allows applicant to be approved under a hardship waiver when criteria are met but does not provide for payment while hardship is determined.	specific criteria; requires the State to consider the purchase of life estate as an asset transfer, unless the person lives on the property for one year after the purchase; requires the State to approve under a hardship waiver when criteria are met and allows the State the option of paying facility care for up to 30 days while eligibility for the hardship is determined.				
Annuities – Medicaid	When determining eligibility, the applicant is asked whether they own or purchased an annuity. If the annuity is actuarially sound (pays out over the person's or their spouse's life expectancy), it is not considered a transfer of assets.	When determining initial eligibility and re-determination, under this bill - the individual is required to disclose their ownership interest in any annuity; requires that the State consider certain annuities as a transfer of assets, unless the State is named as beneficiary of the annuity; requires the State to notify the annuity company of the right as residuary beneficiary;	Upon Enactment	Prevents the use of annuities as a method of sheltering assets.  May result in fewer eligibles either because of counting annuities or customer doesn't want to name DHS as beneficiary.	Minimal since Iowa collects from these annuities under estate recovery, except for annuities purchased in a spouse's name.	None

	1		1		T	1
		Requires the State to treat the annuity				
		as an asset transfer,				
		unless the annuity				
		meets specific				]
i.		criteria, including				
		equal payments				
		over the person's				
		life expectancy.				
Community	A single person	When determining if	Upon	A few couples may have to	Minimal since most	None
Spouse	must spend	one member of a	enactment	pay privately for an	couples will still	None
Resource	resources down to	couple is eligible for		additional month.	qualify.	
allowance	less than \$2,000	Medicaid payment			, qy.	
Income First	before they qualify	of long term care				
	for Medicaid	services, this bill:				
	payment of long-	requires the State				
	term care services.	consider all of the				
	When determining if	income a spouse				
	one member of a	living in the facility				
	couple is eligible for	has available for the				
	Medicaid payment	community spouse				
	of long term care	before allocating the				
	services, the couple	amount of resources	1			·
	is allowed to keep	that can be				
	or protect some	protected for the				
	additional resources	spouse at home.				
	for the spouse at					
	home and still					
	qualify for Medicaid.					
	lowa considers only					
	the at home					
	spouse's own					
	income when					
	calculating the					
	amount of					
	additional resources					
	that can be kept or					
Lana Tarre	protected.	This bill passed to a second	l la ca	Nama	Nama aimaa lauus	None
Long Term	Currently, only	This bill permits new	Upon	None	None, since lowa	None
Care	those states with an	States to use Long	enactment		already has a plan.	
Partnership	approved state plan	Term Care				1

Plan Asset Disregards	amendment for asset disregards due to the Long Term Care Partnership Plan were allowed to exempt the assets for both eligibility determinations and estate recovery. Iowa had an approved State plan as of May 14, 1993.	Partnership Plans and allows the disregards of assets for both eligibility and estate recovery for those new States and imposes additional restrictions on States plans.		·		
Resource Exemptions When Determining Eligibility	A person must spend resources down to less than \$2,000 before they qualify for Medicaid payment of long-term care services. When determining what is a countable resource: a homestead is exempt, regardless of the value; no provisions are in place for how to count entrance fees paid to a continuing care retirement community.	When determining what is a countable resource, this bill: requires that the State limit the value of property that can be exempt as homestead to less than \$500,000 or at the State's option up to \$750,000. Requires the State to consider entrance fees paid to a continuing care retirement community as a countable resource in most cases.	January 1,2006.	Only those with homes valued at more than the maximum will be affected.	Minimal	None
Verification of Citizenship	Verification of citizenship is not required for those who claim to be U.S. citizens or nationals.	Proof of citizenship will be required for all Medicaid applicants and recipients who claim to be U.S. citizens or nationals. Specifies limited	July 1, 2006	Medicaid members will be required to pay \$15.00 per person for birth certificates, if the family does not currently have documents to verify citizenship.	No fiscal impact to state	None

	1	,			1	
		types of				
		documentation that				
		can be used as				
		proof, such as birth certificates.				
SCHIP -	In general, funds for	Authorizes and	Effective	Positive impact for lowans.	This logislation	N/A
Additional	the SCHIP program	appropriates \$283	upon the	lowa is one of the states	This legislation makes additional	14/71
Allotments to	are authorized and	million for the	enactment.	that is projecting a shortfall	federal funds	
Eliminate FY	appropriated for	purpose of providing	enacunent.	in FFY 2006, and this	available to lowa so	
2006 Funding	FY1998 through	additional SCHIP		additional allotment is		
Shortfalls	FY2007. From each	allotments to		intended to make the	that the gap in funding does not	
Shortialis	year's	shortfall states in FY		necessary federal dollars	have to be replaced	
,	appropriation, a	2006. Shortfall		available for lowa to avoid	with state dollars, or	
	state is allotted an	states are defined		the federal funding shortfall.	program cuts made.	
	amount determined	as those with an		the lederal fullding shortials.	program cuts made.	
	by a formula set in	approved SCHIP				
	law. Federal funds	plan for which				
	not drawn from a	(based on the most				
	state's allotment by	recent SCHIP data				
	the end of each	as of December 16,				
	fiscal year continue	2005) the Secretary				
	to be available to	estimates that such	·		1	
	that state for two	state's FY2006				
	additional fiscal	projected				
	years.	expenditures				
		exceed the sum of				
	At the end of the	all funds available				
	three-year period,	for expenditure by				
	unspent funds from	that state in FY2006				
	the original	including: (1) the				
	allotment are	amount of such				
	reallocated in ways	state's FY2004 and				
	that vary depending	FY2005 original				
	on the fiscal year.	allotments that will				
	The original SCHIP	not be expended in				
	law, (i.e., BBA97),	FY2005; (2) the				
	specifies that only	amount, if any, that				
	those states that	is redistributed to				
	spend all of their	such state during				
	original allotment by	FY2006;				
	the applicable	and (3) the amount				

would receive redistributed funds from the other states' unspent allotments, based on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P. L. 106-554 and P. L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY2001 original allotments was				 	
redistributed funds from the other states' unspent allotments, based on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 108-54 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was			of such state's		
from the other states' unspent allotments, based on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e. P. L. 108-544 and P. L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments was since processed on a process determined by the States (FFIS) in Information for States (FFIS) in Issaes (FFIS) in Is			FY2006 original		
states' unspent allotments, based on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  Information for States (FIS) in Issue Brief 06-03: Possible SCHIP Shortfalls; Territorial Medicaid Ceilings, January 9, 2006, the following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.					
allotments, based on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was					
on a process determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  Issue Brief 06-03: Possible SCHIP Schild Is; Territorial Medicaid Ceilings, January 9, 2006, the following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missesispipi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		states' unspent	Information for		
determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP Shortfalls: Territorial Medicaid Ceilings, January 9, 2006, the following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, N		allotments, based	States (FFIS) in		
Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was services (HHS); and these following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		on a process			
and Human Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Medicaid Ceilings, January 9, 2006, the following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Missosippi, Missosippi, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		determined by the	Possible SCHIP		
Services (HHS); and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  January 9, 2006, the following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		Secretary of Health	Shortfalls; Territorial		
and these redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur. The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  following jurisdictions are likely to have 2006 shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.	a	and Human	Medicaid Ceilings,		· ·
redistributed funds would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was		Services (HHS);	January 9, 2006, the		·
would be available for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was    Would be available for one year.	a	and these	following		
for one year. However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur. The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  shortfalls: Illinois, lowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.	r	redistributed funds	jurisdictions are		
However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Islands and the other territories.	\ \ \ \ \	would be available	likely to have 2006		
However, later laws (i.e., P.L. 106-554 and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Islands and the other territories.	f	for one year.	shortfalls: Illinois,		
and P.L. 108-74) overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur. The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.			Iowa, Maryland,		
overrode how the reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.	(	(i.e., P.L. 106-554	Massachusetts,		
reallocation of unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		and P.L. 108-74)	Minnesota,		
unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.		overrode how the	Mississippi,		
unspent FY1998 to FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.	r	reallocation of	Missouri, Nebraska,		
FY2001 original allotments would occur.  The redistribution of unspent FY2002 SCHIP original allotments was  Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands and the other territories.	ι	unspent FY1998 to			
allotments would occur.  Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Puerto The redistribution of unspent FY2002 Islands and the SCHIP original allotments was					
The redistribution of unspent FY2002   Islands and the other territories.   SCHIP original allotments was		allotments would	Dakota, Rhode		·
The redistribution of unspent FY2002 Islands and the SCHIP original other territories.		occur.	Island, South		
The redistribution of unspent FY2002 Islands and the SCHIP original other territories.			Dakota, Puerto		
unspent FY2002 Islands and the SCHIP original other territories. allotments was		The redistribution of			
allotments was	ι	unspent FY2002		•	
allotments was			other territories.		
determined by the From the additional	•   (	determined by the	From the additional		
Secretary of HHS in SCHIP		Secretary of HHS in	SCHIP		
accordance with the appropriation, each			appropriation, each		
default FY 2006 shortfall		default			
redistribution state will receive an	r	redistribution	state will receive an		
provision in allotment to cover	·   r	provision in	allotment to cover		·
Balanced Budget its projected		Balanced Budget	its projected		
Act of 1997 (BBA shortfall or, if the					
'97). Under current appropriated funds					
law, unspent are inadequate to					
original allotments   cover the FY 2006					
from FY 2003 projected shortfalls,					
forward are to be the Secretary must					

				1 0077		
	redistributed according to the original BBA '97 methodology. That is, redistributed funds will go only to those states that spend all of their original allotments by the applicable three-year deadline, with the redistributed amounts determined by the Secretary of HHS and made available for one year only.	distribute the available funds on a pro rata basis based on each such state's estimated shortfall. The additional SCHIP allotments are available for one year only must be made on behalf of targeted low-income children.  On October 1, 2006, any remaining unspent additional allotments will not be subject to redistribution, but will instead revert to the Treasury. Applies to items and services furnished on or after October 1, 2005, without regard to whether or not regulations implementing such amendments have been issued.				
SCHIP- Prohibition Against Covering Childless Adults Sec. 6102	Section 1115 of the Social Security Act provides the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) with broad authority to conduct research and demonstration	Limits the authority of the HHS Secretary to approve Section 1115 waivers that allow federal SCHIP funds to be used to provide assistance to childless adults	Effective upon the enactment.	Currently, lowa does not cover adult populations, but it will limit the options that lowa has for covering this population with Title XXI funds. There is a positive impact to lowa, in that the provision will limit funding to child populations, upon	May have a positive impact for lowa, as this limits the populations that can be covered with Title XXI, and may increase the allotment amounts and the re-distribution	N/A

		4 4 11 12 141 11		
projects	(provides an	enactment, thus limiting the	amounts to states.	
under six programs,	exception for	use of federal Title XXI		
including Medicaid	pregnant women).	dollars. This may increase		
and SCHIP. Under	The provision would	the amount of funds		
Section 1115	allow the Secretary	available for re-distribution.		
authority, the	to continue to			
Secretary may	approve projects			
waive certain	that expand the			
statutory	SCHIP program to			
requirements for	caretaker relatives			
conducting these	of Medicaid or			
projects.	SCHIP-eligible, and			
	to pregnant adults.			
For SCHIP, no				·
specific sections or	Provides for the			
requirements are	continuation of			
cited as "waive-	existing Medicaid or			
able." SCHIP	SCHIP			
statute simply	waiver projects			
states that Section	(and/or extensions,			
1115, pertaining to	amendments, or			
research and	renewals to such			
demonstration	projects) affecting			
projects, applies to	federal SCHIP funds			
SCHIP.	that had been			
	approved under the			
Under the Bush	Section 1115 waiver	·		
Administration, a	authority before the			
new Health	date of enactment.		·	
Insurance	auto of officialities.			
Flexibility and				
Accountability				
(HIFA) Initiative was				
implemented using				
1115 waiver				
authority for both				
Medicaid and				
SCHIP. The goals				
of this initiative are				
to encourage new				
approaches that will				
increase the				

SCHIP- Continued Authority for Qualifying States to Use Certain Funds for Medicaid Expenditures Sec. 6103	number of individuals with health insurance coverage within current program resources, with a particular emphasis on broad statewide strategies that maximize private health insurance coverage options and target individuals with income below 200% of the federal poverty level.  For specific Medicaid expenditures occurring after August 15, 2003, current law permits certain states to receive the federal SCHIP matching rate for the coverage of certain children enrolled in regular Medicaid (not an SCHIP Medicaid expansion).  Specifically, for services delivered to Medicaid beneficiaries under the age of 19 the coverage	The provision would continue the authority for qualifying states (Qualifying states are: Connecticut, Hawaii, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington and Wisconsin), to apply federal SCHIP matching funds toward the coverage of certain children enrolled in regular Medicaid (not an SCHIP Medicaid	Effective on or after October 1, 2005.	lowa does not currently use federal SCHIP funds toward the coverage of certain children enrolled in <i>regular</i> Medicaid.	Neutral	N/A
	beneficiaries	Medicaid (not an				

family income that exceeds 150% of	allow qualifying states to use any			
the FPL, federal	available FY 2004			
SCHIP funds can	and FY 2005 SCHIP			
be used to pay the difference between	funds (i.e., FY2005			
the SCHIP	original allotments, and/or FY2004 and			
enhanced federal	FY2005 retained			1
matching rate and	allotments or		•	
the regular	redistributed funds,			
Medicaid federal	as the case may be)			
matching rate the	for Medicaid			
state receives for	services made on or			
these children. The	after October 1,			
maximum amount	2005 under the 20%			
that qualifying	allowance.			1
states may claim				
under this				
allowance is the				
lesser of the				
following				
two amounts: (1)				1
20% of the state's				
available FY 1998				
through FY 2001				
original SCHIP				1
allotments; and (2) the state's balance				
(calculated				
quarterly) of any				
available FY1998 to				
FY 2001 federal				
SCHIP funds				
(original allotments				
or reallocated				
funds). If there is no				
balance, states may				
not claim 20%				
spending.				
Qualifying states				
include those that				

SCHIP -Hold harmless for Katrina Impact	on or after April 15, 1997, had an income eligibility standard for children (other than infants) of at least 184% of the FPL. (Other qualifications apply to states with statewide waivers under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act.).  Under current law, no 20% spending will be permitted in FY 2006 or any fiscal year thereafter.  The federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) is the rate at which	Authorizes the HHS Secretary to for purposes of computing Medicaid	Effective on or after October 1, 2005.	Does not impact lowa	Neutral	N/A
Sec. 6053 (b)	states are reimbursed for most Medicaid service expenditures. It is based on a formula that provides higher reimbursement to states with lower per capita incomes relative to the national average (and vice versa); it has a statutory minimum of 50% and maximum of 83%.	and SCHIP federal matching rates (FMAPs) for any year after 2006 for a state that the Secretary determines has a significant number of individuals who were evacuated to and live in the state as a result of Hurricane Katrina as of October 1, 2005, to disregard the evacuees and their incomes.				

	1(110044							
Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted		
Child Care (CCDF)	NA .	\$1B increase in mandatory funding (5 years) – Iowa = \$1.8M/year No CCDF policy changes were included	\$200M/y ear increase retroactiv e to fiscal year 2006	While the DRA provides additional federal funds for childcare, this increase is insufficient to meet both the childcare caseload growth/increas ed costs projected exclusive of any impact from the DRA, and the additional demand for childcare/cost s estimated needed to meet increased TANF work rates under the DRA effective 10-1-06. As current state law prohibits waiting lists for childcare for FIP families, any anticipated	Although the \$1.8M increase in federal childcare funding is expected to be sufficient to cover any increase in childcare for FIP families to meet TANF work rates under the DRA, it will have little effect, if any, on any shortfall resulting from the childcare caseload growth/increased costs projected exclusive of any impact from the DRA.	TANF		

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
				shortfall in total funding to meet all childcare needs will affect non-FIP families.		
IV-E Admin claiming for candidates for foster care.	Currently there is no specific policy that mandates a specific 6 month review for foster care candidacy status.	Determinations would be required every 6 months for children that are considered candidates for foster care.	10/1/05	Failure to complete the required determinations would result in a loss of \$1.1M in federal funding. This would in turn result in fewer DHS social workers, diminishing DHS ability to protect children and help meet their needs.	In order to complete the determinations and avoid the loss of \$1.1M, DHS would need  Staff to complete determinations  Staff training  Computer system changes Total state cost \$282,067.	NA
Sec. 7309:	Federal Financial	No Federal Financial	10/1/07	Families will	Child Support	TANF loses \$3.3M
Child support incentives	Participation for federal incentives earned is 66%	Participation for federal incentives earned		lose up to \$66.5M in collections.	Recovery Unit loses \$13.5M in federal funding.	state share of collections.
Sec. 7310: Child support fee	No annual fee for any child support cases.	\$25 annual fee for cases that were never on FIP after \$500 of support is collected each year. Must pay 66% to federal government. State choice on who pays:	10/1/07	Collections may decrease depending on who pays.	Minimal fiscal impact depending on who pays.	None identified. Effective date assumes Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement will agree Iowa needs to change legislation to

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
		custodial parent, noncustodial parent, or State.				implement.
Sec. 7307: Child support medical support	If a noncustodial parent has health insurance available through employer at reasonable cost, medical support provisions must be in the order. We do not enforce medical on cases with orders with provisions for custodial parent to provide medical.	The state must seek orders for medical support from either parent who has health insurance provided by the employer, and enforce these orders. There appears to be a broader definition of medical support not yet clarified.	10/1/07	Decrease in collections if staff are diverted from collecting support to amend orders and if CSRU needs to begin enforcement against the custodial parent.	Unknown fiscal impact. Federal government is to issue regulations.	For those parents who do not have access to health insurance, it is unclear if the mandate to include medical support in all orders will increase coverage for children. Medicaid may see decrease in costs.
Sec. 7302: Child support Review and Adjust	Child support is required to notify parents of their right to request a review and adjustment every three years.	Mandatory Review and Adjust for all FIP cases every 3 years.	10/1/07	Decrease in collections if staff are diverted from collecting support. Potentially lower obligation amounts.	Unknown fiscal impact.	If staff are diverted or if obligation amounts on FIP cases are lower, decrease in TANF collections.
Sec. 7308: Child support genetic	Federal Financial Participation for genetic testing is 90%	Federal Financial Partcipation for genetic testing is 66%	10/1/06	Minimal impact.	Child Support Recovery Unit loses \$35,477 in	None identified.

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
testing Federal Financial Participation					federal funding.	
Sec. 7301: Child Support assignment	Families assign all unpaid prior child support in addition to the months they receive FIP to the state.	Families who begin receiving FIP on or after 10/1/09 will only assign support accruing during the months they receive FIP.	10/1/09	Increase amount of collections families keep.	Unknown fiscal impact. Decrease in collections reimbursing TANF assistance paid.	TANF loses unknown amount of collections.
Sec. 7301: Optional Child support distribution		Options are provided to send more money to families rather than keeping as reimbursement for TANF benefits.	10/1/09	No impact if options are not implemented.	No fiscal impact if options are not implemented.	None identified.
Sec. 7301: Child support federal income tax offset	Federal income tax refunds are offset to collect past due support on nonpublic assistance children only if they are still minors.	Offsets can be made on nonpublic assistance children who are no longer minors.	10/1/07	Increase nonpublic assistance collections.	Minimal fiscal impact.	None identified.
Sec. 7301: Child support automated expedited interstate collections	States may only open a case on ICAR for all establishment and enforcement services.	States may open a case on ICAR for limited enforcement services.	10/1/07	Unknown impact.	Unknown fiscal impact.	None identified.
Sec. 7303: Child support	Passport sanction initiated if obligor	Passport sanction initiated if obligor over \$2500	10/1/07	Increase non- public	Minimal fiscal impact.	None identified. Effective date assumes

Subject Matter	Current Policy (Now)	DRA Federal directive (Future)	Effective Date (bullet FY 06,07 etc)	Impact on customers	Fiscal impacthow much will the state need to make up	Other programs that will likely be impacted
passport	over \$5000	delinquent.		assistance		Federal Office of Child
sanction	delinquent.			collections.		Support Enforcement
	_					will agree Iowa needs
						to change legislation to
						implement.
Sec. 7306:	Insurance claims	Insurance claims match	When	None. Iowa	None. Iowa	None identified.
Child support	match is not	may be conducted by	federal	already	already	
insurance	conducted by federal	federal government.	govt is	participates	participates in	
claims match	government and		ready.	in match	match voluntarily.	
	participation is			voluntarily.		
	voluntary.					